

RETURN

(50)

To an ADDRESS of the HOUSE OF COMMONS, under date March 16th, 1903, being a copy of all correspondence exchanged, since last Session, between the Canadian Government and the British authorities on the subject of the Embargo on Canadian Cattle.

R. W. SCOTT,
Secretary of State.

EXTRACT from a Report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 26th June, 1902.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration a despatch, dated July 21, 1901, from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the colonies, respecting the restrictions imposed on the importation of Canadian cattle into the United Kingdom, in reply to the Minute of Council approved by His Excellency on May 15, 1901.

The Minister of Agriculture, to whom the said despatch was referred, observes that it is stated therein that the views of the Canadian ministers have received careful consideration from the Board of Agriculture, but that for the reasons mentioned in a report from that body, a copy of which is inclosed, its members are unable to propose to parliament the modification or repeal of the Diseases Animals Act, 1896, which requires the imposition of the restrictions in question.

The despatch further states that, owing to the power which the Board of Agriculture possess, under the aforesaid Act, of prohibiting altogether the landing, presumably of cattle, from any country outside the United Kingdom in which cattle disease exists, being at present exercised in respect of every country save Canada and the United States, exporters of Canadian cattle are, even without the change desired, in an exceptionally advantageous position.

A reasonable answer to this comment lies in the fact, to which attention was directed in the Minute of Council already referred to, that Canada being an integral part of the empire, and one of its most important sources of food supply, present and future, may fairly be considered entitled to much more favourable treatment, in matters of this nature, than any foreign country, the United States not excepted.

The minister, in reply to the report of the Board of Agriculture, states that there was, and is, no misunderstanding on the part of the Canadian government as to the existing position of the question from a legal point of view. The Canadian government was well aware that the regulations requiring Canadian cattle to be landed at a foreign animals wharf for slaughter there, was and had been from 1896, a statutory one.

The view taken by them, however, was that the reason the Act passed in 1896 was so drafted as to include Canadian cattle as well as foreign animals properly so called, was the same misconception as to the existence in Canada of contagious pleuro-pneu-

monia which gave rise to the embargo imposed in 1892, and that, had it not been for the existence of the said embargo, the question of including Canadian cattle among those dealt with by the Act of 1896 could not possibly have arisen. Their argument was, therefore, directed against the original order of 1892, rather than the statute of 1896, the inclusion in which of Canadian cattle they consider to be only a result or continuation of the former, from their point of view, mistaken action.

No useful object would now be served by reopening the discussion of the reasons which led the Board of Agriculture to issue the order of 1892 ; but, in view of the fact, now openly admitted, even by the experts of the Board of Agriculture, as well as by the president of that body, that contagious pleuro-pneumonia does not exist in Canada, a hitherto unconsidered aspect of the case may reasonably be mentioned. If the original order was justifiable, this disease, one of the most contagious, fatal and uncontrollable maladies to which cattle are subject, and which has decimated the herds of every country where it ever obtained a foothold, has in Canada quietly disappeared of its own accord without one case having been detected by our inspectors, without a single animal having been quarantined, much less slaughtered, and without the expenditure of a penny of public money. This is a remarkable record, but one which cannot be disputed, if the veterinary experts of the Board of Agriculture were right, and the Canadian authorities were wrong in 1892 and 1893.

The mere statement of the case from this point of view, should be sufficient to induce the Imperial government to remove from Canadian cattle the stigma placed upon them by the order of 1892, and perpetuated by including them in the legislation of 1896, the only ostensible reason for which was the prevention of the introduction of this disease.

The minister cannot but consider as most unfair the treatment accorded to the Dominion in this matter, whereby Canadian cattle are, contrary to the facts, publicly declared on the authority of the government of the mother country, to be affected with disease of such a nature as to render them a source of danger to the cattle of any country permitting their importation.

Were the legislation affecting them a part of, or in connection with the fiscal policy of Great Britain, the case would be entirely different and no reason for complaint would exist, at least on the grounds now set forth. As matters stand, however, the reputation for health and soundness of Canadian cattle is being sacrificed without reason. It must not be forgotten that the plea of a clean bill of health, past and present, can be urged by no other country affected by the legislation of 1896, and that therefore the charge of unfair treatment holds good only in the case of Canadians who are British subjects.

The minister further states that the argument advanced by the Board of Agriculture, that the trade in live animals between Canada and the United Kingdom has not suffered because, since the passing of the Act of 1896, it has not diminished, takes no account of the enormous increases in the quantities of other agricultural products exported from Canada to Britain during the period indicated. There is no doubt that but for the legislation in question, the live cattle trade would have grown in equal, if not greater proportion, to the mutual benefit of both countries.

That with reference to the difficulty of reconciling the opinions of experts on occasions when the appearance of disease is reported, it may be pointed out that during the last eight years over 800,000 heads of Canadian cattle have been slaughtered in Britain subject to inspection, without this difficulty having been encountered.

The minister submits that the decision of the Board of Agriculture, to the effect that after consideration of the Minute of Council laid before them last year 'they cannot propose the modification or repeal of the Act of 1896,' is a most inadequate and unsatisfactory reply to the arguments advanced in the said Minute, and particularly to the request that action be taken to relieve the cattle of Canada from the unjust and unfair imputation cast upon them by the Order of 1892, and emphasized by their inclusion in the operation of the Act of 1896.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 50

The committee advise that the administrator be moved to transmit a copy of this Minute to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the colonies.

All which is respectfully submitted for the Administrator's approval.

JOHN J. McGEE,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto.

DOWNING STREET, August 20th, 1902.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Sir H. Strong's despatch No. 231 of the 3rd of July, transmitting an approved Minute of the Privy Council on the subject of the existing restrictions on the importation of Canadian cattle into the United Kingdom.

2. In reply I have to transmit to you, for consideration of your ministers the accompanying copies of a memorandum on this subject which has been prepared by the Board of Agriculture.

J. CHAMBERLAIN.

Privy Council.

Referred to Minister of Agriculture.

JOHN J. McGEE.

September 8, 1902.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE IMPORTATION OF CATTLE FROM CANADA INTO THE UNITED KINGDOM.

MEMORANDUM BY THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

Diseases of Animals Acts, 1894 and 1896.

The resolution adopted by the Canadian House of Commons on the 1st ult., which is to be submitted for consideration at the approaching colonial conference, raises an issue of a general character, which has been the subject of public and parliamentary discussion for the past forty years.

Shortly stated, the question is whether: (1) a fixed rule shall be prescribed requiring all imported animals to be slaughtered under official supervision at the port at which they are landed, or (2) a discretionary power may safely be given to a Public Department to dispense with this requirement if they consider it safe to do so.

The latter policy was that which, after much discussion, was embodied in the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878—an Act which was subsequently consolidated with others in the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894.

The Act of 1878 provided (fifth schedule) that imported animals should be landed at what were to be known as foreign animals wharfs, out of which the animals were not to be moved alive, but the Privy Council, whose duties in the matter were subsequently transferred to the Board of Agriculture, were required to relax this provision and to waive the requirement of slaughter whenever they were satisfied, with respect to any country, that

(a.) The laws thereof relating to the importation and exportation of animals, and to the introduction or spreading of disease; and

(b.) The general sanitary condition of animals therein, were such as to afford reasonable security against the importation of diseased animals.

The provision of the Act of 1878 remained in force until 1896, but throughout that period various difficulties were found to attend its administration.

Amongst these difficulties may be mentioned—

- (a.) The difficulty of diagnosis in the case of the more obscure diseases, and in their early stages ;
- (b.) The conflict of expert opinion ;
- (c.) The impossibility of obtaining prompt, accurate and continuous information as to the condition of other countries with regard to disease ;
- (d.) The invidiousness of the task of drawing distinctions between the statements of one government and those of another, and of refusing to give credence to the evidence tendered ;
- (e.) The difficulty of keeping *au courant* with the changes of the law in other countries and of relaxations allowed thereunder ;
- (f.) The impossibility of ascertaining the extent to which the laws of another country are efficiently enforced and administered.

The first illustration of the difficulties attending the exercise of the duties imposed upon the department by the Act of 1878 arose in 1879, in the case of the United States, and the latest in 1894, in the case of Canada. In both instances diplomatic correspondence ensued, and somewhat heated discussion arose in non-official circles which promised to continue indefinitely—it lasted for seventeen years in the case of the United States—with results by no means favourable to the maintenance of good relations between the various interests concerned.

In the eighteen years during which the Act of 1878 was in operation considerable expenditure was incurred, and great sacrifices were made by stockowners in this country to clear their herds and flocks from disease. In 1877 no fewer than 2,007 outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia were reported, the number of cattle attacked being 5,330. In 1889 the number of outbreaks was reduced to 474 with 1,646 cattle attacked, whilst in 1895 only one outbreak was recorded with 43 animals attacked.

It was also demonstrated that the mere inspection of imported animals on their arrival could not afford security against the introduction of diseases, especially as regards pleuro-pneumonia in cattle, and scab in sheep, animals which have been examined at the ports and passed as healthy having been found to be affected when slaughtered a few days later.

It was, moreover, ascertained that the compulsory slaughter of imported animals at the ports was compatible not only with the maintenance, but even with the rapid development of the trade.

Thus, in the case of the United States the imports of live cattle, which were 11,538 in 1877 and 68,450 in 1878, when admission into this country was unrestricted, had risen to 276,533 in 1895, and were as many as 403,946 in 1901, although slaughter at the ports was made obligatory in 1879.

In the case of Argentine a trade of considerable magnitude was created and developed under the rule as to slaughter. The imports from that country were only 653 cattle and 22,082 sheep in 1890, but in 1895 they had risen to 38,763 cattle and 306,262 sheep, and in 1899 they were 85,365 cattle and 382,080 sheep.

The imports from Canada have remained practically at the same level before and after the enforcement of the rule.

It was in view of these considerations that the Act of 1896 was passed and a statutory condition prescribed, which is applicable at all times and to all countries alike. No question now arises, or has at any time arisen since that date, either as to the sanitary condition of animals in Canada, as to the laws relating to the admission of animals into the Dominion from the United States and other foreign countries, or as to the administration and enforcement of those laws and of the laws relating to diseases of animals generally.

The disadvantages of the 'in-and-out' arrangement in operation between 1878 and 1896 have already been referred to. These are, of course, avoided by the existing law, but in addition, it may be observed, not only that friction and difficulty are avoided, and the danger of the introduction of disease diminished by the adoption of

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 50

a fixed rule, but that the sudden dislocation of trade conditions is prevented and uncertainty and insecurity removed. Breeders are able to make their arrangements without fear that they may at any moment find themselves face to face with a large augmentation of the supply of foreign store stock. Graziers can tell with certainty from what sources it is open to them to supply their requirements. Colonial exporters have a certain knowledge of the conditions under which they have access to the home markets, and they run no danger of a sudden refusal on our part to admit store stock due to some untoward circumstance as regards the prevalence of disease. The value of stable and fixed conditions, from a trader's point of view, is universally recognized, and, as will be seen from the figures cited above, the condition of prompt slaughter at the port is not one which is destructive of trade, or is inconsistent with a largely increased importation of live animals for food.

It may, perhaps, be added that there is nothing in the existing law which is opposed to the Imperial conception. The regulation, and even prohibition, of the movement of animals, in order to prevent the spread of disease, is of almost daily occurrence in the United Kingdom. There has never been a time since operations against contagious diseases were commenced when it could be said that there existed free and unrestricted movement of animals within the limits of the United Kingdom. The importation of animals from Great Britain into Ireland is at times prohibited; regulations requiring the prompt slaughter of Irish swine have on several occasions been made by local authorities in Great Britain, and the movement of animals from one part of Great Britain to another is frequently prohibited.

There seems to be no likelihood, in view of the above consideration, that parliament would repeal the Act of 1896, and reverse a policy which has provided additional security against the introduction of disease and greater confidence and certainty to breeders and feeders of stock, without any serious detriment to the interests of exporters shippers, and consumers.

A copy of the proceedings at the reception by Mr. Banbury of a deputation on this subject on the 9th October last is annexed.

6th June, 1902.

T.H.E.

OTTAWA, December 15, 1902.

MY DEAR MR. FISHER,—At the colonial conference held in London last year, notice was given on behalf of the Canadian government of a resolution favouring the removal of the embargo imposed by the Imperial government against the importation of Canadian cattle into the United Kingdom. The conference was of opinion that the question concerned the Imperial and Canadian governments only, and on the suggestion of Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Wilfrid Laurier it was arranged at a meeting of the conference on the 5th August that the subject should be referred to the Right Honourable Mr. Hanbury, President of the Board of Agriculture in the Imperial government, and myself on behalf of the Canadian government. In pursuance of appointment, I met Mr. Hanbury on the 7th August last for the discussion of the subject with a view, if possible, of steps being taken for the removal of the embargo.

At the very commencement of the discussion Mr. Hanbury stated that perhaps it would save a lengthy argument if he were to explain the attitude of the Imperial government, and thereupon he proceeded to do so. He pointed out that under the original provisions of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, the Board of Agriculture was empowered to establish the embargo against the importation of live cattle, and in their discretion to relax its provisions by waiving the requirement of slaughter whenever they were satisfied with respect to any country that its laws in regard to importation and exportation of animals, the introduction or spreading of disease, and

the general sanitary condition of animals in such country afforded reasonable security against the importation of diseased animals. He further stated that until 1896 the law left it discretionary with the Board of Agriculture to remove the embargo against any country whenever, having regard to the provisions of the Act, the Board was satisfied so to do. He stated that so long as the law was in this condition questions were constantly arising between his government and those of other countries affected by the regulations as to whether the maintenance of the embargo against such other countries was or was not justifiable; that whenever a country was scheduled a dispute arose as to the accuracy of the views expressed by the board's veterinarians which had led to this scheduling. He observed that, owing to the latent nature of disease, examination at the port of entry of large numbers of cattle afforded unsatisfactory evidence as to their being immune from disease, and that in consequence the British farmers were constantly exposed to the danger of disease being imported into their herds and flocks, and that accordingly the Imperial government had decided as a matter of policy, having for its object the protection of the herds and flocks of the British farmers, to alter the law and remove the discretionary power in question from the Board of Agriculture, and by Act of parliament prohibit importation. Hence the passage of the Act of 1896 which repealed the discretionary power vested in the Board of Agriculture, and excluded foreign cattle from importation into the United Kingdom except for slaughter at the port of entry.

Mr. Hanbury stated that his government was satisfied that Canadian herds and flocks were free from disease, and that the Act of 1896 was not occasioned by any suspicion to the contrary but was general legislation applicable to all countries. He concluded by saying that inasmuch as it was practically impossible to determine satisfactorily by diagnosis whether at the early stages cattle were or were not diseased, his government was not in the interests of the British farmer, prepared to take the chance upon this point by permitting the entry of any cattle from outside countries, and would not be prepared to entertain a proposition looking to a repeal of the provisions of the Act of 1896.

At the conclusion of Mr. Hanbury's remarks I stated that I would be glad if he would give me in writing for your information the views to which he had just given expression, and he promised to do so, and subsequently I received from him his letter of August 9, 1902, which I herewith inclose together with copy of my reply. I pointed out to him that the law enabled him to fix the number of days within which imported animals were required, to be slaughtered at the port of entry, and that at present the maximum number was ten days, and I requested an extension from ten to thirty days. In support of this application I argued that frequently it happened that large numbers of cattle arriving at the same time, and all having to be slaughtered within ten days, there were frequent gluts in the dead meat market, a condition of affairs very injurious to the interests of both the Canadian and British farmer. Moreover it sometimes happened that cattle suffering from the sea voyage were not in fit condition for slaughter within ten days, and it would be helpful if they could be allowed to remain a short time longer at the port of entry so as to be fattened up for slaughter. In reply to this request Mr. Hanbury expressed the opinion that he could see no objection to it, and would favourably consider it and write me upon the subject. Not having heard from him, I wrote him on October 21, 1902, and received his reply dated November 21, thereafter, copies herewith inclosed together with copy of my acknowledgment of December 13, which concluded the correspondence.

W. MULOCK.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 50

HERBERT HOUSE, BELGRAVE SQUARE,

August 9, 1902.

DEAR MR. MULOCK,—I am sorry that there should be any misconception either as to the motive of the Act of 1896 or as to the present effect of that Act. There is no question whatever between us about the existence of disease in Canada. I have more than once publicly stated we believe Canada to be free from disease among both herds and flocks. The exclusion of your store cattle is due not to any suspicion of disease but to the fact that the Act of 1896 forbids the entry into this country (except for immediate slaughter at the wharfs) of all live sheep and cattle from all countries. There is therefore no reflection upon Canada as a cattle producing country in the circumstance that the operation of the Act is general and indeed universal. But there is on the other hand a distinct recognition of the immunity of Canada from disease in the fact that Canada and the United States are the only two countries from which fat cattle can be landed for slaughter at the wharfs, and their exceptional position is due to the admitted freedom of both from disease. The Act of 1896 does not therefore imply that Canada is not free from disease, while the existing regulations as to fat cattle distinctly declare our belief that disease does not exist there.

The Act of 1896 was certainly not passed with any special reference to Canadian store cattle. For several years the feeling had been growing that in the interest of the consumer no less than in justice to the farmer every reasonable precaution must be taken to prevent the spread of disease among the flocks and herds of this country. The danger of the importation of disease is very great when store cattle are allowed to be shipped to this country and travel to every corner of it. The examination at the port of entry must necessarily afford a very inadequate security partly on account of the large numbers to be examined but mainly because the disease often remains latent for a period much longer than that of the voyage and at the time of entry there are no external symptoms indicating its presence to the veterinary surgeon. So long as the importation of store cattle from other countries was freely permitted cases of this kind were by no means infrequent.

So long, too, as the importation of store cattle from any particular country depended not upon an Act of parliament making the prohibition universal but upon regulations of the Board of Agriculture, admitting or prohibiting the entry of such cattle from a country on the ground that that country was for the time free or not free from disease, questions repeatedly arose between us and the country affected by our regulations as to whether our veterinary advisers were right or wrong in declaring the existence of disease. Although this alone would not have been a sufficient reason for passing the Act of 1896, that Act has had the further advantage of removing the possibility which had hitherto existed of friction occurring whenever such questions unfortunately arose upon the actual facts of particular cases.

I need not perhaps deal with the other causes which led to the alteration of the law in 1896, because they were all due to the dangers at all times attending the importation of store cattle and their general dispersal all over this country. No special country, I repeat, was in view when general legislation of this nature was introduced.

It is satisfactory to find that the importation of fat cattle from Canada has largely increased—and it is, I am sure, unnecessary for me to add that anything which can reasonably be done to increase such a trade between Canada and the mother country ought to be done. When I had the pleasure of meeting you last Thursday, you referred for instance to the advantages which might accrue to that trade if the limit of ten days within which cattle arriving at our ports must be slaughtered were somewhat further extended. On that point I am having inquiries made, the result of which I hope to communicate to you very shortly. Meanwhile I need only say that it would be a pleasure to meet the wishes of Canadian exporters in this respect to the utmost extent to which that can be done consistently with adequate security for the safety of our own flocks and herds, and so far as I am concerned, no merely formal objections or removable difficulties shall be allowed to stand in the way.

R. W. HANBURY.

2-3 EDWARD VII., A. 1903

HOTEL CECIL, August 12, 1902.

The Right Honourable R. W. Hanbury,
President Board of Agriculture.

DEAR MR. HANBURY,—Permit me to thank you for your letter of the 9th instant, explaining fully the reason for the passage of the Act of 1896 and the attitude of the Imperial government with reference to the importation of live cattle into the United Kingdom.

Whilst regretting that there appears no prospect of a removal of the embargo, it is gratifying to learn from your letter that neither the passage of the Act nor its continuance is based upon the theory that Canadian herds and flocks are not free from disease.

W. MULOCK.

OTTAWA, October 21, 1902.

The Right Honourable R. W. Hanbury, M.P.,
President Board of Agriculture,
London, England.

MY DEAR MR. HANBURY,—Now that your parliament has resumed its sitting, I assume that you have returned to labour, and therefore would trouble you again with reference to the question of slaughtering Canadian cattle. You may remember that at our interview I made a request that the period of ten days at present allowed Canadian cattle to remain unslaughtered on arrival at an English port be extended to thirty days, and you expressed yourself favourable to granting the request. One consideration caused you to hesitate, namely, whether there was sufficient accommodation at Deptford, &c., and other points to admit of cattle being kept alive so long, but on this point you may remember I stated that, if this accommodation was insufficient, the Canadian government would be glad to bear the expense of any increased accommodation necessary in order to admit of your extending the ten-day limit.

The present regulation requiring slaughter within ten days is a great injury to the Canadian cattle trade, and I think cannot be of any service to the English farmer; on the contrary must also prejudice him and the middleman. For example, if a considerable number of cattle arrive in England about the same time, all having to be slaughtered within ten days, there is a constant glut of dead meat in the English market, depressing the price in England, in that way prejudicing interests in your own country, and also at the same time depressing prices in Canada. If you would extend the time, then the cattle could be slaughtered more gradually thus less disturbing the market, keeping prices steady and fairly uniform, instead of having them as at present subject to those extreme variations, perhaps at times to the advantage of the speculators but not in the interests of cattle producers.

There will no doubt be great disappointment throughout Canada when it is learned that beyond peradventure the Imperial government will not remove the embargo. There being no disease amongst Canadian cattle, it is almost impossible for us to satisfy the Canadian farmers why your embargo is maintained, in fact it is regarded as unjust. If, however, we could announce, in connection with your decision to maintain the embargo, that the ten-day limit had been extended to thirty days, it would no doubt take the edge off the disappointment, and go to show our people that you were anxious, as far as possible, to study Canadian interests.

WM. MULOCK.

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 50

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
4, WHITEHALL PLACE, S.W.,
November 21, 1902.

DEAR SIR W. MULOCK,—After our conversation last August, I at once, instituted an inquiry at the various foreign animals wharfs as to the result which would be likely to follow an extension of the period of ten days at present allowed for the slaughter of imported cattle, and I invited the opinion of the port authorities and our veterinary officers on such a proposal.

I find that there has been no demand for an extension of the time for slaughter by consignees and others interested in the trade on this side, and that neither the United States nor Argentina have made any such suggestion.

The inclosed figures (A) returned up to the end of September this year from the four principal ports show that in the case of 98 out of the 158 cargos of Canadian cattle which reached those ports not one animal remained unslaughtered at the end of the 9th day, and in the case of the other 60 cargos, the cattle slaughtered on the tenth day, represent not whole cargoes but merely the surviving animal or animals from shiploads, the bulk of which had been killed on earlier days. The statement (B) furnished by the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, the port authority for Birkenhead, which receives as many cattle as all our other wharfs together, further shows that in 1901 only 98 per cent of the animals landed there from Canada, and the United States remained alive till the tenth day, the great majority being slaughtered by the seventh day.

The rapid deterioration of the cattle when not killed within four or five days of landing and the expenses of their keep are no doubt the explanation of these figures. Should it be desired to avoid placing the meat upon a gutted market, which is the main purpose of the proposed extension of time, a much more convenient and cheaper mode of avoiding this difficulty is afforded by the ample cold storage accommodation which is provided at the wharfs.

The present period of ten days before slaughter would therefore appear to satisfy all the practical requirements of the trade, and if it is desired to postpone a sale beyond those ten days cold storage provides the cheapest and least detrimental means of doing so. On the other hand an extension from ten to thirty days would, if advantage were largely taken of it, involve a risk of disease to our home stock out of all proportion to any benefit which Canadian exporters might hope to receive.

The opinion of the port authorities (with the single exception of Glasgow) and of our veterinary officers at all the wharfs is adverse to any extension of the time. They are convinced that were such a change made the danger of introducing disease would be greatly increased. The larger number of animals congregated in the wharfs, the slaughter of so great an accumulation immediately the market became favourable, the increased difficulty in disposing of offals and manure and in disinfecting the lairages within the short time available before the reception of a fresh cargo and the additional difficulties in controlling and supervising the disinfection of the larger number of drovers, attendants, &c., would all contribute to such a result. These practical dangers would be enormously added to were disease found in the wharf, and it would become extremely difficult to insure that infection should not spread to the outside.

The fact that the wharfs belong either to private companies or to local corporations, and not to the British government, would make it less practicable for either this or the Canadian government to bear the expense of increasing the accommodation, though were the period for slaughter extended a very large increase of such accommodation would necessarily be required.

I have not referred to the strong pressure which would be exercised to extend the period in the case of the other exporting countries on the not unreasonable ground that it is specially difficult to make exceptions in guarding against disease. Even within the United Kingdom itself, one county frequently prohibits the introduction of animals from other counties altogether, or only allows it on very stringent conditions.

2-3 EDWARD VII., A. 1903

I need not, I hope, assure you of the pleasure which it would have given me to meet your wish had it been practicable to do so. My regret at finding these serious difficulties in the way is, however, partially removed by the evidence I have quoted to show, that even the existing period of ten days is so seldom taken advantage of, and by the provision already made at our wharfs of other and probably even more effective means of meeting the main object which you have in view.

R. W. HANBURY.

STATEMENT showing for the nine months January–September, 1902, the Number of Cargoes of Canadian Animals slaughtered on each day within the limit allowed by Article 11 of the Foreign Animals Order of 1896, at Bristol, Glasgow, Liverpool, and London, respectively.

Port.	Day after arrival on which slaughter was completed										Total number of Cargoes.
	1st.	2nd.	3rd	4th.	5th.	6th.	7th.	8th.	9th.	10th.	
Bristol			1	1	3	3	5	4	17
Glasgow.....							1	8	36	45
Liverpool	2	8	3	2	15	2	6	3	7	48
London.....		. . .	1	3	4	5	6	5	11	13	48

SESSIONAL PAPER No. 50

STATEMENT showing the Number of Cattle slaughtered at the Birkenhead Foreign Animals' Wharf on each day after landing during the five years 1897-1901.

—		Year 1897.	Year 1898.	Year 1899.	Year 1900.	Year 1901.
	Slaughtered on 1st day after landing	76,707 or 27·23 p.c.	62,355 or 24·50 p.c.	77,705 or 31·28 p.c.	53,380 or 23·75 p.c.	57,761 or 23·67 p.c.
"	2nd	45,684 16·20 "	48,679 19·13 "	47,930 19·29 "	37,823 16·83 "	42,021 17·22 "
"	3rd	55,041 19·54 "	51,520 20·24 "	46,142 18·57 "	41,454 18·45 "	44,746 18·34 "
"	4th	45,542 16·17 "	38,873 15·27 "	32,612 13·12 "	30,746 13·68 "	34,017 13·94 "
"	5th	25,469 9·05 "	22,309 8·76 "	19,952 8·03 "	21,814 9·71 "	25,591 10·49 "
"	6th	13,809 4·90 "	12,370 4·86 "	12,297 4·95 "	16,372 7·28 "	18,653 7·65 "
"	7th	9,426 3·35 "	9,140 3·59 "	6,237 2·51 "	11,540 5·13 "	10,285 4·22 "
"	8th	5,690 2·01 "	4,285 1·68 "	3,328 1·34 "	6,274 2·79 "	4,944 2·03 "
"	9th	2,822 1·00 "	2,533 1·00 "	1,539 ·62 "	3,195 1·42 "	3,271 1·34 "
"	10th	1,413 ·50 "	2,050 ·80 "	664 ·27 "	2,133 ·96 "	2,401 ·98 "

2-3 EDWARD VII., A. 1903

OTTAWA, December 13, 1902.

The Right Honourable R. W. Hanbury, M.P.,
President Board of Agriculture,
London, England.

DEAR MR. HANBURY,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of November 21, taking exception to the proposed extension of the term (10 days) within which Canadian cattle landing in the United Kingdom are required to be slaughtered. The subject, so far as this government is concerned, belongs to the Department of Agriculture, and I have therefore transmitted your letter to my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture.

The fact that Canadian cattle are slaughtered before the last day does not, I submit, warrant the conclusion that the present ten-day limit does not prejudice Canadian interests.

It will be very unfortunate if there be no relaxation of the present most injurious regulations. I therefore hope your view is not to be regarded as your final decision. It also occurs to me that inasmuch as efforts are now being made for reciprocal development of trade between the United Kingdom and Canada, the present would seem an inopportune time for your government to render a decision that would not certainly be helpful, so far as Canadian sentiment is concerned, in advancing the trade relations between the two countries.

Perhaps you would not mind discussing this point with the President of your Board of Trade.

WM. MULOCK.